UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office/Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/080,503	02/22/2002	Robert I. Higuchi	18202-018001 / 1082	8671	
	20985 7590 09/25/2007 FISH & RICHARDSON, PC			EXAMINER .	
P.O. BOX 1022			CRANE, LAWRENCE E		
MINNEAPOLI	S, MN 55440-1022		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1623		
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE	
			09/25/2007	PAPER	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

•	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/080,503	HIGUCHI ET AL.	
Exammer-initiated interview Summary	Examiner	Art Unit	
	L. E. Crane	1623	
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_	
(1) <u>L. E. Crane</u> .	(3)		
(2) Office of Stephanie Seidman.	(4)		
Date of Interview: 18 September 2007	Time:		
Type of Interview: ☐ Telephonic ☐ Video Conference ☐ Personal (Copy given to: ☐ Applicant Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: ☐ Yes ☐ Yes, provide a brief description:	nt's representative)		
Part I.			
Rejection(s) discussed: None			
Claims discussed: 40 and 58			
Prior art documents discussed: None		·	
Part II.		•	
SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENER See Continuation Sheet	AL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	DISCUSSED:	
Part III.			
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redirectly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability. It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate redid not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary 	examiner will provide a writte	in summary of the substance interview, since the interview	
·	·		
Mr ban			
(Exampler/SPE Signature) (Applicant/	Applicant's Representative Sig	nature – if appropriate)	

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed:

Examiner noted that the submitted request for certificate of correction included serious errors including non-correspondence between claims 40 and 58 in the original claims and these same claims in the proposed corrections. Examiner indicated that this was the reason for the denial of this request and respectfully requested an amended request.